



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

its ultimate substitution for "Jacob," Steuernagel rejects the theory, which now has so many adherents, that Jacob was originally a Canaanite people, quite distinct from the Israel tribes, which appeared later on the scene. He also suggests (with some hesitation, it should be observed to his credit) that *ישראל* may have been derived from *איש רחל*.

As for the general results of the investigation which occupies this division of the book, it must be said that Steuernagel can fairly claim to have made some new and real gains for the history of Israel. At the same time it must be added (what is, indeed, inevitable in such a difficult undertaking as this one) that a part of the distinctly new conclusions will hardly meet with general acceptance. Thus, for example, the ingenious, but extremely precarious, combinations based on Gen., chap. 38 (pp. 79 f.); the conclusions drawn from the mention of Reuben in Numb., chap. 16 (pp. 102 f.); the identification of the Balaam of Numb., chaps. 22-24, with Laban (p. 104); and so on.

In the third and last division of the book, dealing with the chronology, the available material found in the Egyptian records and the El-Amarna letters is carefully sifted. The most important conclusion reached here is the identification of the "Khabiri" with the Leah tribes, which, according to his theory, must have entered the land some time before the Jacob-Rachel tribes.

The book is provided with two indexes; the one of subjects, the other of Old Testament passages.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

MODERN CRITICISM AND THE PREACHING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH. New York: Armstrong & Son, 1901. Pp. xii + 325. \$1.50.

"THE eight lectures in this volume—or at least as much as it was possible to read in the time allotted—were delivered before Yale University in 1899. I have thought it best to leave them as lectures; that is, in the style of spoken discourse. With one exception they are printed as they were prepared for delivery, but I have worked into four of them—I, III, IV, and VI—some material from books which have appeared since they were spoken, . . . Obviously eight lectures cannot provide an exhaustive treatment of these themes; but the lectures contain, I trust, enough to serve their purely practical aim, and to exhibit to students and preachers the religious effects of the critical interpretation of the larger half of the Scriptures of the church."

These words from the author's preface state clearly how this volume came into existence, and the limitations under which he worked.

These limitations were not favorable to the production of a "book," using that word in the highest literary sense of a writing that is dominated by one great idea or living principle, and in which the details are so co-ordinated, subordinated, and harmonized that the result may be called an organic unity. We have before us rather eight vigorous lectures, which since their delivery have been to a slight extent modified or supplemented. Nevertheless, since Professor Smith, besides being a scholar of wide range and special skill, has the gifts of a great preacher, men of different points of view may appreciate and be helped by the fine poetic flashes, the fresh, sparkling statements, the tender, sympathetic, and forcible appeals by which he seeks to make the preacher realize the vastness of the spiritual treasure which in Old Testament history, poetry, and prophecy lies waiting for his service.

As regards the substance of the volume, however, we think that it must be admitted that Professor Smith in his endeavor, first to produce a convincing apology, and second to impress upon preachers the vastness and variety of the treasure which the Old Testament still offers to them, has produced a series of striking statements rather than a well-balanced account of the growth of Israel's religion, and has given to many of his illustrations such summary treatment that the result is often unsatisfactory. Hence it would require several essays to traverse, even in a superficial way, the ground covered by the volume, and in a brief review we can only indicate the lines along which we must proceed in order to justify the statement made above.

It is no use attempting to minimize the difference between the traditional view and the critical treatment of the Old Testament. The difference is immense; they involve different conceptions of the relation of God to the world; different views as to the course of Israel's history, the process of revelation, and the nature of inspiration. We cannot be lifted from the old to the new position by the influence of a charming literary style or by the force of the most enthusiastic eloquence. Those who have made the passage know that there is no golden road, but it is rather a way of the cross not to be trod lightly, and the goal is reached only through intellectual travail and spiritual pain. This thought is forced upon us when our author in his brilliant, energetic fashion raises so many questions that he cannot adequately pursue, and when it sometimes seems doubtful from what standpoint he is arguing.

"It is plain, then, that to whatever heights the religion of Israel afterwards rose, it remained before the age of the great prophets not only similar to, but

in all respects above mentioned identical with, the general Semitic religion ; which was not a monotheism, but a polytheism with an opportunity for monotheism at the heart of it—each tribe being attached to one god, as to their particular Lord and Father.”

A vast field for discussion is opened up by this typical sentence. We take “great prophets” to mean the writing prophets of the eighth century, and the context seems to justify that interpretation. Then we maintain that the form of the statement is too crude to do justice to the real situation, as it is conceived by a criticism which is both radical and reverent. “Polytheism” is not a sufficiently distinctive term for Israel’s religious faith at this time ; for we are not speaking of coarse, popular views, but of the highest point that has been reached. Our author affirms that at this stage we have not got beyond “polytheism ;” the only advantage is that this polytheism has “an opportunity for monotheism at the heart of it,” and the opportunity is defined to be the fact that each tribe is attached to one god. We need not discuss the view that the union of a number of tribes each having a separate god might at first rather be regarded as an opportunity for “polytheism” than monotheism. We are content now to maintain that at the period mentioned the Hebrew religion in its real representative was far beyond this. Professor Smith himself soon reveals this, and in the course of the lecture he furnishes a powerful illustration of the fact that it is very difficult to carry on, at the same time, a delicate piece of constructive work and a popular apology. The realization of “this opportunity,” we are told, cannot be accounted for by *political* considerations, nor by *intellectual* influences. “We turn, therefore, to Israel’s *ethical* attainments before the eighth century, and here, in the opinion of all critics, we at last find proofs of the distinction of her religion from that of the other Semites, and the sources of the monotheism which culminated in her prophetic writings.” But surely ethical attainments cannot be separated from the religion in this abstract fashion. It was the ethical spirit and no mere opportunity which was at the heart of the religion and gave it its distinctive character and growing power. Besides, this analysis is external and popular in the extreme. We cannot cleave things with an ax in this style. Though the Hebrew genius was not at this stage “metaphysical,” with such ethical attainments a very high order of intellectual activity must go, and in the development of both the political circumstances had a powerful influence.

But, to proceed, we have now to account for the ethical superiority.

Critics carry back its origin to the time of Moses. "Israel in the time of Moses enjoyed the same motives to ethical development as we have seen existing in other Semitic tribes." Israel's unique success in taking advantage of such opportunities is not accounted for by her intellectual superiority, or the historical character of her religion; hence we must believe that "this covenanting Deity had from the first revealed his moral attributes." Here we have the same external analysis and a phraseology which has the flavor of the old theological standpoint. If there was revelation of "moral attributes" in the consciousness of a righteous God at that early stage, there was real distinction notwithstanding many external similarities. We are driven to conclude that Professor Smith has not given a satisfactory statement of the development of Israel's religion, and that he has not always distinguished with sufficient clearness between the popular life and the higher religious movement.

If Professor Smith has any defects, lack of courage is not one of them. When extreme conservatives in the northern Presbyterian church were forging new fetters in the form of a strange doctrine of "inerrancy," the Scotch professor was addressing an American audience in this bold style: "Reviewing the whole of this lecture, we may say that modern criticism has won its war against the traditional theories. It only remains to fix the indemnity" (p. 72). And further he charges the highest tribunal of his own church with using ecclesiastical power arbitrarily in expelling an illustrious predecessor from his chair. It is plain, however, that, if the battle is won, the complete victory is confined to a special circle, and there is an immense amount of educational work still to be done in the church. Hence this tone of the conqueror demanding the indemnity is resented by those who occupy the old standpoint and who have never realized the full cumulative force of the arguments for the new construction. The "indemnity" figure of speech is striking enough for rhetorical purposes, but, when it is closely examined, we find that it does not represent very correctly the process of "gain through loss;" we need not trouble about "indemnity" in exchanging a lower for a higher form of truth.

But to proceed to another example of our thesis. Professor Smith has given a brief sketch of the history of Pentateuch criticism—we cannot call it a mere summary, for his genius as an expositor flashes out even in the briefest statement—but we think that this section is too condensed to be of the highest service to those who are new to the subject. We regret this all the more because we are convinced that, if

students are to gain a competent knowledge of and real sympathy with the theory of documents, they must approach the subject through its history, not simply to learn that such criticism is not now a new thing, but also to realize that it has a history which resembles that of every real science, and to perceive how the different stages of its growth were conditioned by the circumstances of the time. There are now many sketches of this kind, including the latest, the neat outline in the first volume of the *Oxford Hexateuch*.

The second lecture deals with "The Liberty and Duty of Old Testament Criticism, as Proved from the New Testament." With its effort to show that strict, courageous investigation is in harmony with the freedom of spirit that Christ inspires, and is of great practical importance from the evangelical point of view, we heartily sympathize. As to the general position that the Savior made large use of the Old Testament in a reverential spirit and at the same time handled it freely, of this there can be no doubt. Further, that the way in which the apostles treat the Old Testament shows the working of a new free spirit in the minds of men who had been trained under the influence of a hard, narrow, dogmatic system of doctrine and ceremonial, this also can scarcely be denied by those who look fairly at all the facts of the case. In dealing with such themes Professor Smith's vigorous antithetic style is appropriate and impressive. But if these and other considerations had to be dealt with in one lecture, would it not have been possible to have dealt with them in a practical manner and popular style, without bringing in the difficult question of the canon? And if the lecturer must discuss the canon, would it not have been better to have given it a more elaborate and careful treatment? We may be mistaken, but our judgment is that this brief, hasty discussion of the canon is not essential to the general purpose of the lecture, and is too slight to be of much service to any particular class of readers.

The lecture opens with this statement: "Few realize that the church of Christ possesses a higher warrant for her canon of the Old Testament than she does for her canon of the New." We cannot enter into an elaborate discussion concerning the correctness of this statement, but we venture to say that it will be difficult for the few to realize this after reading the lecture. The word "canon" had a fairly definite technical sense under the old view; with the old dogmatic method one could at least draw a clear line between books from which "proof-texts" could be drawn, and those which were rejected altogether or used only for "edification." The question arises how far

the idea of a "canon" is affected by the historical method and the all-pervading conception of development. We cannot demand that our author should treat this question for our enlightenment, but we contend that we are well within the lines of just criticism in pointing out that in this volume the new point of view is only half assimilated. "The Old Testament canon is accredited in addition by an authority of which the New Testament is devoid. This is the authority of Jesus Christ himself." Some may think that this lands us in a peculiar position, seeing that we depend upon the New Testament for the true picture of Jesus Christ and the correct reflection of his teaching.

But we must limit ourselves to one point. In spite of Professor Smith's disclaimer, is not this an "external" view of authority? Would it not have been possible to have set forth Our Lord's splendid testimony to and moral criticism of the Old Testament literature without nibbling in this way at the question of the exact limits of the canon? "Christ himself seems to testify to the limits of the Hebrew canon, exactly as they now lie in Genesis and Chronicles." If we are to have Christ as an "authority" for that point, how are we to escape the appeal to his authority when made in support of the traditional interpretation? We have this final authority for the "canon," but yet criticism is justifiable and necessary because "the apostolic writings nowhere define the limits of the Old Testament canon." Surely either the word "canon" is used loosely, or it would have been better to have omitted the appeal to authority. That the books existed then in substantially the same form as we have them now scarcely calls for elaborate proof in a volume of this kind, but the question of the limits of the canon cannot be settled in this summary fashion. It is, indeed, an exceedingly interesting question, how far and in what way the new point of view and method modifies our view of "a canon," but it is not faced here; and in a book that champions the advanced position and volunteers to discuss "the canon" one might reasonably have expected a more thorough discussion.

It is not necessary for us to point out and praise the beautiful passages and suggestive sections of the book. Being asked to give a sober estimate of its character and merits, we conclude that it is at its best where the wonderful expository and preaching qualities of the author can have full play, but that, in regard to the underlying criticism, this is weakened by the fact that too many subjects are discussed, while sometimes there is vacillation as to the point of view and lack of thorough consistency in the treatment. That the book has already

awakened so much interest, and stimulated such keen discussion, is in itself no slight service, and for this we owe to the author our kindly acknowledgments and cordial gratitude.

W. G. JORDAN.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Can.

TRIGLOT DICTIONARY OF SCRIPTURAL REPRESENTATIVE WORDS
IN HEBREW, GREEK, AND ENGLISH. By HENRY BROWNE.
London: Samuel Bagster & Sons; New York: James
Pott & Co., 1901. Pp. xv+506.

THIS volume contains the results of a physician's leisure hours, and is evidently a labor of love. It represents an immense amount of work. The author has proceeded upon the supposition that every Hebrew word has one equivalent in English and in Greek, and only one. Hence he arranges the English words of the Bible alphabetically in one column on the page and sets the Greek and Hebrew equivalents in parallel columns. It is difficult to see the wisdom of this arrangement; it appears as though an alphabetical arrangement of the Greek or Hebrew would have been preferable, since there is little occasion for translating English into Greek or Hebrew, and much for translating Greek and Hebrew into English. But a more serious defect is the fact that the fundamental principle of the work is weak. Any attempt to limit each Hebrew and Greek word to one unvarying English equivalent takes no account of the progress of human thought. Two thousand years ago many words represented each several sub-concepts which were not yet clearly differentiated from each other in thought, much less in speech. Today these sub-concepts are recognized and each receives its own label. Sometimes when a word was used one phase of its content was dominant in the mind of the writer, at other times other phases were in his thought. Hence when the context clearly indicates what the particular shade of meaning in a word is, does it not seem more accurate to define that meaning precisely by an exact term, than to apply some large and indefinite name which may mean almost anything? What one word, for instance, will accurately represent פָּקֶד everywhere? Certainly not "to make overseer," the meaning given here. Similar difficulty arises with such words as נָתַן, רוּחַ, חֲכָמָה, נֶפֶשׁ, לֵב. It is interesting to note that the author regards the meaning of נֶפֶשׁ as having been fully settled in 1866 by Mr. Heard's *Tripartite Nature of Man: Spirit, Soul, and Body*.